



3763

PATENT

Case Docket No. CTLIMM.001CP1

Date: August 24, 2001

Page 1

In re application of : Kündig, et al.

App. No. : 09/380,534

Filed : September 1, 1999

For : A METHOD OF INDUCING
A CTL RESPONSE

Examiner : Michael Hayes

Art Unit : 3763

I hereby certify that this correspondence and all
marked attachments are being deposited with the
United States Postal Service as first class mail in
an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner
for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on

August 24, 2001

(Date)

Michael L. Fuller, Reg. No. 36,516


ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED
SEP 04 2001
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

Sir:

Transmitted herewith is a Response to Office Action mailed May 25, 2001 (Paper No. 13) in the above-identified application.

- (X) Return prepaid postcard.
- (X) Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.


Michael L. Fuller
Registration No. 36,516
Attorney of Record



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Kündig, et al.

) Group Art Unit: 3763

Appl. No. : 09/380,534

) I hereby certify that this correspondence and all
) marked attachments are being deposited with the
) United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an
) envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for
) Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on

Filed : September 1, 1999

For : A METHOD OF INDUCING
A CTL RESPONSE

) August 24, 2001
) (Date)
)
) Michael L. Fuller, Reg. No. 36,516

Examiner : Michael Hayes

RESPONSE

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
 Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the official action mailed May 25, 2001 (Paper No. 13) for the
 above-referenced patent application.

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 and 39-65 remain presented for examination. No claims have been canceled,
 amended, or added herein. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for examination of the
 pending claims.

Discussion of Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-21, 39-41, 43-53, and 55-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being
 unpatentable over Puccetti et al. or Grohmann et al. in view of Elliott et al. (U.S. Patent No.
 5,478,556), Nabel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,348,470), Amkraut et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,439,199),
 and/or Mertelsmann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,908,433).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all requirements of a three-prong test
 must be satisfied. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references or

PATENT #15
 Response
 J. Bryce
 9/5/01